UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,)	Case No. CR 15-541 54
Plaintiff,) v.)	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME ED UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT DEC 1 1 2015
John China En Lee) Defendant.	SUSAN Y. SOONG CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on <u>Dec 1/201</u> 5the Court excludes time under the Speedy Trial Act from <u>Dec 11, 201</u> to and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):	
Failure to grant a continuance would be like See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	ely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the prosecut or law, that it is unreasonable to expect ade itself within the time limits established by the Failure to grant a continuance would deny that taking into account the exercise of due diligious Failure to grant a continuance would unreast counsel's other scheduled case commitments See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	the number of the existence of novel questions of fact quate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial his section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii). The defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, gence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). Sonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given ts, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
necessary for effective preparation, taking i See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	nto account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: <u>Oec.</u> 1/2 201€	United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney